DIRECTOR'S REPORT

DECEMBER 1984

CALIFORNIA
POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION
COMMISSION

DIRECTOR'S REPORT
DECEMBER 1984

Task Force on Women and Minority Faculty and Staff in Postsecondary Education

"Turning the Corner? Higher Education Finance for the Rest of the Eighties"

Recommendations of the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education

Conclusions of William J. Bennett, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, in To Reclaim a Legacy

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814

The Director's Reports of the California Postsecondary Education Commission are a monthly series of papers about issues affecting colleges and universities in California. Copies are sent to Commissioners and to college and university officials for their information, and are available from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814; telephone (916) 445-7933.

Recent reports include:

October 1982: The State's Fiscal Situation for the First Quarter, 1982-83, State Legislation, Recommendations Affecting Higher Education of the California Commission on Industrial Innovation.

December 1982: The State's Fiscal Situation in 1982-83 and Possible Effects on Postsecondary Education.

January 1983· Preliminary Review of Provisions in the 1983-84 Governor's Budget Regarding Postsecondary Education; Opening Fall 1982 Enrollments in California Colleges and Universities; Current Status of the "Investment in People" Programs.

February 1983: The 1983-84 Governor's Budget

March/April 1983: Overview of the 1983-84 Governor's Budget for Postsecondary Education in California.

June 1983: Crucial Times: A Statement by Patrick M. Callan; Pending Decisions on the State's Budget for 1983-84 and Their Possible Impact on Public Postsecondary Education; Impact of 1982-83 Budget Constraints on the California Community Colleges: Results of a Commission Survey.

July 1983: Appropriations in the 1983-84 State Budget for the Public Segments of Postsecondary Education.

October-November 1983: Testimony to the Assembly Special Committee on the California Community Colleges, East Los Angeles, October 26, 1983, by Patrick M. Callan; A Prospectus for California Postsecondary Education, 1985-2000.

December 1983: The State's 1983-84 Budget and Public Postsecondary Education; 1982-83 State Legislation.

January-February 1984: The 1984-85 Governor's Budget

March 1984 California Higher Education, 1973-1983· A Ten-Year Retrospective on Thirty Trends in California's Colleges and Universities

April 1984: Overview of the 1984-85 Governor's Budget for Postsecondary Education in California.

July 1984. The 1984-85 State Budget for the Public Segments of Postsecondary Education.

September-October 1984: The State's 1984-85 Budget and Public Postsecondary Education; State Legislation; Potential Fiscal Impact on California Postsecondary Education of the November Ballot Propositions.

Commission Report 84-35

December 1984

CONTENTS

TASK FORCE ON WOMEN AND MINORITY FACULTY AND STAFF IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

The California Postsecondary Education Commission and the leaders of California's three segments of public higher education -- the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California -- have established a joint Task Force on Women and Minority Faculty and Staff in Postsecondary Education to review current policies and recommend further steps for increasing the number of qualified women and ethnic minority group members for faculty or staff appointment in public higher education.

Named to the joint task force from the segments and the Commission are:

California Community Colleges:

Constance Carroll, President, Saddleback College South Campus, Mission Viejo

Roy Kanamaru, Administrator for Affirmative Action, Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges

The California State University:

James M. Rosser, President, California State University, Los Angeles

Caesar Naples, Vice Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Relations, The California State University

University of California:

Ira M. Heyman, Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley

Joyce B. Justus, Special Assistant to the Vice President, University of California

California Postsecondary Education Commission:

Patrick M. Callan, Director

Marjorie Dickinson, Director of Special Projects

The segments and Commission have charged the task force to undertake five primary activities:

1. Review the current status of women and minority employment among faculty and staff of the segments;

2. Examine prospects for increasing the pool of qualified women and minority group members and improving existing programs and policies designed to enlarge this pool, based on the availability of faculty and staff positions,

3. Consider steps that can be taken to enlarge this pool, based on an examination of (a) degree completion rates of women and minorities, and (b) successful affirmative action programs in California and elsewhere;

4. Consult about these prospects and steps with faculty and administrative leaders of California's public and private institutions of higher education, representatives of interested women's and minority organizations, and other interested parties; and

5. Make recommendations to the Governor, Legislature, segments, and Commission for action leading to greater participation of women and underrepresented minorities in faculty and staff positions in California public postsecondary education

Much data for use by the task force in its analyses will be provided by the Commission's forthcoming report, Women and Minorities in California Public Postsecondary Education, 1975-1983, which summarizes reports from the three segments regarding their progress in recent years at increasing the employment, job-level classification, and compensation of women and minorities in these positions.

"TURNING THE CORNER? HIGHER EDUCATION FINANCE FOR THE REST OF THE EIGHTIES"

An Address by Patrick M Callan, Director,
California Postsecondary Education Commission, to the Tenth Annual Conference on Higher Education, The Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona, Tucson,
November 29, 1984

Optimism now prevails on many campuses -- on some it verges on outright euphoria. While I welcome this positive mood fostered by our emergence from recession and fiscal stringency, my professional responsibility as director of a state higher education agency requires a certain skepticism, at least with regard to following the crowd. After all, the goal of planning is to be ahead of the game -- anticipating how to allocate new funds during the worst times and preparing to deal with the retrenchment which invariably follows any growth cycle

Today, I would like to share with you some thoughts on our circumstances and prospects. Specifically, I shall describe the condition of higher education finance as I see it, identify some critical fiscal problems which continue with us after the crisis, and indicate some challenges which appear on the horizon.

WHERE WE STAND NOW

Where does the finance of higher education stand now? In terms of a perspective from the past decade, it is clear that the overall financing of colleges and universities was uneven, during "good" and "bad" years alike. In terms of the whole enterprise, the evidence suggests that we have experienced two distinct periods. Although not as accurate as we would prefer, the data published by NCES shows that, between the years 1970-71 and 1979-80, current fund expenditures divided by FTE students, in constant dollars, increased by 5 percent for both public and independent institutions, reaching a 15-year high in 1980. However, between 1979 and 1981, expenditures divided by FTE students dropped by 5.3 percent in public institutions and by 3 percent at independent institutions (National Center for Education Statistics, The Condition of Education, 1984, p. 84).

That erosion continued until this current year when data reported by M. M. Chambers indicates a two-year increase of 16 percent in total dollars and an 8 percent "real" gain. Despite the narrow focus of the Chambers data on state appropriations, it is one important indicator since the fortunes of public, and to some extent private, higher education are directly linked to the fiscal condition of the states.

Although higher education appears to have done relatively well in terms of state appropriations, it is premature to proclaim that "happy days are here again " Recently, the National Governors' Association reported that, "although

the national economy has made a strong recovery, . . . the fiscal condition of the states will improve at a much slower pace" (The Fiscal Condition of the States, 1984, p. 1). The survey anticipated "moderate growth" in constant dollar spending by states in 1984 after "significant drops in 1982 and 1983" (p. 5). In fact, the 1984 expenditures will be lower than in 1981, in constant dollars

The report from the Governors' Association also reveals the uneven nature of this recovery. Five states account for 42 percent of the projected $3 billion in year-end balances among all states in 1984. Further, 19 states are expecting to close their books with year-end balances less than 2 percent of their expenditures, and 11 expect a zero balance or a deficit, including Texas which enjoyed a surplus of more than a billion dollars two years ago.

But, in looking ahead, I am optimistic about the widespread and renewed public commitment to investment in education. For one thing, the "Taxpayer's Revolt," at least in its devastating form, seems to be past. In the November elections from Michigan to Hawaii, including California where Howard Jarvis first inspired the "revolt," voters defeated a variety of tax limitation measures. Among the most prominent reasons was the fear that these cuts would put the nation even more "at risk" for education than it is now. Further, higher education has consistently ranked among the more respected institutions in public opinion, and that reputation influences political decisions. One recent poll indicated that people placed federal spending on higher education as third in priority, behind only medical research and medical care for the aged. Of those polled, 63.3 percent felt that aid to higher education should be increased (Group Attitudes Corporation, American Attitudes Toward Higher Education, 1984).

So, despite the obvious problems in using aggregate fiscal statistics for higher education to demonstrate a recovery and despite the anemic condition of revenues in most states, I do believe that many colleges and universities have turned an important corner.

CRUCIAL PROBLEMS WHICH WE BRING INTO THIS NEW ERA

While the immediate future might be upbeat, we bring some profound fiscal problems into this new era.

Faculty Salaries

First is the fact that the purchasing power of faculty salaries has declined by 20 percent over the past 15 years ("The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 1983-84," Academe, July-August, 1984, p. 3). Although this is unfortunate for faculty presently employed, the implications for the future of higher education are particularly ominous. Interestingly, though, Howard Bowen points out that, until the 1950s and 1960s, when salaries actually increased in real terms, faculty never expected more than a modest living. Complaints such as Thorstein Veblen's in his Higher Learning in America about the "squalid salaries at Stanford" were much more common than were favorable comparisons to those in other professions.

Regardless of one's opinion about the "benefits of genteel poverty" associated with scholarship, this relative decline mars the attractiveness of teaching and jeopardizes our ability to convince the best students to pursue long years of education so they can serve in the professorate. We often hear that opportunities for young faculty will abound in the 1990s when senior professors retire and the numbers of students will increase again. Unfortunately, decisions are being made right now by people who will be called on to fill those positions. The fact that only two-tenths of 1 percent of freshmen plan on careers as professors, a decline of 89 percent since 1966, suggests that the best students are not choosing careers in academia.

Facilities and Equipment

Second, our labor intensive industry is becoming starved for capital. As you know, construction, maintenance, and equipment are typically the items cut first during retrenchment. Since governments have pulled out of their fiscal tailspin, capital considerations are receiving attention -- or at least much rhetoric. But even if some dollars do flow after the rhetoric, I doubt that we can easily reverse certain trends In his dramatically titled book, Crumbling Academe, Harvey Kaiser of Syracuse University estimates the total costs of needed repairs in higher education at $40 to $50 billion, a large amount primarily due to the inferior construction of "instant facilities" during the 1960s and cuts in capital and maintenance budgets lately. This "need," however, represents an expenditure one-third larger than all state appropriations annually for higher education nationwide

Related to these capital or "infrastructure" problems is the need to replace and upgrade educational equipment, especially expensive devices for scientific investigation. A recent survey indicated that laboratory instruments in universities were nearly twice as old as those of leading commercial enterprises. "Disgraceful" was the term applied to the condition of these university research facilities by President Reagan's Science Advisor, George Keyworth (National Commission on Student Financial Aid, Signs of Trouble and Erosion, 1983, p 33).

However great the difficulty of meeting the entire need for facilities and equipment replacement, I do think that the present condition of some state treasuries affords an opportunity to reduce some of these deficits. The reason is that state officials, who are justifiably skeptical about the permanence of economic recovery, do not want on the one hand to generate the surpluses which fueled "the tax revolt" nor, on the other, to increase permanently the support budget. Capital improvements allow them to solve this problem.

Student Charges, Aid, and Debt

Third, the trend toward higher student charges in the face of dwindling amounts of student financial aid is troubling. Tuition, of course, has recently increased at a rapid pace in some states because of budget deficits and policies to raise both student charges and financial aid grants for needy students Unfortunately, while tuition was being increased annually between 10 and 15 percent, the total government and institutional support

for student aid declined by 7.2 percent (from $17.347 billion in fiscal 1981 to $16.095 billion in fiscal 1984), due primarily to cuts in Pell grants and specially directed aid such as social security. As a result, the "self-help" burden threatens to overwhelm the way students finance their education, which will profoundly affect patterns of enrollment.

Let me provide some illustrations. Even in 1980 -- the high point for federal aid -- an NCES survey found that one-third of all bachelor-degree recipients had some kind of debt, with the median at $2,500. Many graduate and professional students are now finishing their programs under the spectre of debts exceeding $10,000, and the trend is toward increasing amounts. The National Commission on Student Financial Aid recommended just last December that the current limits on guaranteed loans be increased -- a proposal at once realistic and alarming.

This "self-help" burden is crucial for public policy toward higher education Ten years ago, a debate raged over whether access was best promoted by low or high student charges, as reviewed by Jacob Stampen in The Financing of Public Higher Education. The persuasiveness of the arguments has shifted with changing times and the condition of public treasuries, but the high tuition adherents have often prevailed, most recently in Minnesota. Without judging the merits of their case, let me suggest that the advocates of steep increases in student charges assume at least two things. first, that financial aid will be provided to needy students; and, second, that the economic value of higher education to individuals will not decline. Of late, neither assumption has held: student aid is not keeping pace with tuition increases, and many studies -- including the work by Steven Dresch with regard to graduate education -- suggest that the economic value of a diploma has fallen sharply in comparison with other employment requiring less formal schooling. These trends seem to indicate that high tuition policies may be leading us down a path which should be reconsidered

CHALLENGES ON THE HORIZON

In addition to these problems from the past decade -- the declining attractiveness of faculty salaries, growing capital outlay needs, and an increasing burden of "self-help" in student charges -- colleges and universities will face new challenges in the future. Let me review some which are most important from the standpoint of state policy.

1. Despite recent reports from national agencies which call on the federal government for major commitments to both undergraduate and graduate education, fiscal initiatives in higher education will lie with the states.

The policy of President Reagan for reducing social services to deal with the federal deficit suggests that higher education must look elsewhere for new support. The states and private sources are the only realistic alternatives for improvements in education, but they are reluctant to spend dollars in

higher education across the board, as was the case when enrollments were growing. Rather, the emphasis is on directed programs -- ones that enhance quality in demonstrable ways; promote cooperation with the private sector, promote research which stimulates the local economy, improve facilities and buy equipment. For example, Tennessee has established a $10 million fund for endowed chairs, while Alabama has offered free college board and tuition to students who promise to teach math or science after graduation, and California has begun a five-year "buy out" of obsolete instructional equipment at its four-year institutions.

2. We will need to pay more attention to the effectiveness as well as to the measurable outcomes of undergraduate education.

The nation's attention, insofar as it ever focuses on any public enterprise, has been fixed on our public schools. This concern was bound to reach higher education, and perhaps the first evidence of this is seen in the recent Report of the Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education. Others are scheduled to follow, and they will have their own particular concerns, challenges, and prescriptions.

But how can the states improve undergraduate education? Frankly, the budget is an awfully blunt instrument to accomplish reforms directly, but the Study Group on the Condition of Excellence did offer some sound recommendations for governments·

- Support formulas and current budget practices should be pruned of fiscal incentives that divert resources away from undergraduates and lower-division students.

- Special and alternative funding should be established for both public and private institutions to promote student involvement and institutional assessment.

- Efforts should be made to change the fact that "advisement is one of the weakest links in the education of college students."

- Some funding for innovations and risk taking should be provided, beyond simply recognizing outstanding programs.

3. We should all be troubled by the eclipse of access on the national agenda

In the late 1960s, Black, Hispanic, and American Indian students made relatively rapid gains in enrollment. The federal government and many states launched programs for equal educational opportunity that motivated disadvantaged students and provided them with financial aid, tutoring, and encouragement. Despite these efforts, from the mid-1970s to 1980 the growth of these students as a proportion of the student bodies nationally came to a virtual

standstill. Now, the American Council on Education reports that the percentage of minorities on campus compared to the general population has actually begun to shrink. Further, most of these students are enrolled in non-science or math-based fields which will limit their career choices. Even when minorities enroll, the statistics about their graduation rates are disappointing. Although I have not seen recent data, I doubt that the situation has changed much from the 1970s when Alexander Astin reported that 34 percent of the whites who entered college in 1972 had received a bachelor's degree by 1976, compared to only 16 percent of the Hispanics and 24 percent of the Black students.

As a result, most colleges and universities have an "access" problem in that their student bodies do not reasonably reflect the population as a whole Apparently, we were not terribly effective in attracting disadvantaged ethnic minority members when access was a major national priority. How much less are the chances for doing so now, unless the states and institutions pose a strong countervailing force to recent trends?

In stressing access, I do not oppose higher standards for incoming students. Obviously, excellence in education is critical in the long run for all social groups. However, we must not abandon efforts to insure that "excellence" is attainable by all, and that improving "standards" is not simply a means for racial discrimination and fewer opportunities for the disadvantaged.

Further, I believe that we should keep "access" high on the agenda for both philosophical and practical reasons. Such an emphasis is inherently right because of higher education's promise of opportunity and upward mobility, and it is politically wise because the pendulum will undoubtedly swing back to make equal educational opportunity a political priority once again.

4. A critical need exists for a new kind of leadership in higher education, and the states should promote its emergence.

Certainly the recent past has not been pleasant for leaders in higher education, but the crisis was positive in testing those who came during the "boom" years and expected an easy means to success. Although the wide swings on the fiscal roller coaster will probably not continue, this does not signal a return to "business as usual." Rather, this period of restoration requires us to make changes that will carry higher education into the Twenty-First Century.

The next few years are an opportune time for leaders who can deal with situations different than the extremes of prosperous growth or crisis management. One vision of this opportunity is contained in a recent publication entitled Presidents Make a Difference, from a commission sponsored by the Association of Governing Boards and chaired by Clark Kerr. "Our colleges and universities are in desperate need of leadership," the commission alleges, mainly because "the attractiveness of the presidency has declined" (pp. xii, 3) While I agree with the report's central assertion that "strengthening presidential leadership is one of the most urgent concerns on the agenda of higher education in the United States" (p. 102), this should not come through administrative autocracy or at the expense of accountability.

Turning to the commission's specific recommendations, we find that most deal with governing boards but a few have fiscal implications. For example, the commission recommends:

> (1) a policy to recover one to three percent of a budget each year by eliminating old programs in order to undertake new programs or to improve remaining on-going ones, and (2) a policy to set aside one percent of the budget for discretionary use by the president on ad hoc projects--to finance a symposium, to support a faculty or student research project, to assist with some cultural event not already budgeted (p. 10).

Within the limits of reasonable budgeting practices and formulas, these policies should be welcomed and encouraged by legislators and governors.

TOMORROW'S PRIORITIES

To conclude, I believe that higher education has emerged from difficult times, but we still face the lingering problems of less-than-attractive faculty salaries given the education required, a declining physical plant, and student charges which threaten educational opportunity We are now entering an era where fiscal initiatives must come from the states and from private sources, where the quality and effectiveness of undergraduate education should be a priority, where "access" must be re-emphasized by states and institutions alike, and where new kinds of leadership should be encouraged. By recognizing these needs, we can be dealing with tomorrow's priorities rather than worrying exclusively about yesterday's crises or today's challenges

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY GROUP ON THE CONDITIONS OF EXCELLENCE IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

At the request of the director of the National Institute of Education (NIE), seven university educators have proposed a 27-step program to renew excellence in the nation's colleges and universities. Among these seven educators, who formed NIE's "Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education," are two Californians and two former Californians:

> Alexander W. Astin, professor of higher education and director of the Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles;
>
> Howard R. Bowen, professor of economics and education, Claremont Graduate School;
>
> J. Herman Blake, president, Tougaloo College, and former provost of Oakes College, University of California, Santa Cruz, and
>
> Harold L. Hodgkinson, senior fellow, Institute for Educational Leadership, and former staff member of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.

The NIE Study Group was chaired by Kenneth P. Mortimer of the Pennsylvania State University. Its other two members were Zelda F. Gamson of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and the University of Massachusetts at Boston, and Barbara Lee of Rutgers University.

PERSPECTIVE OF THE STUDY GROUP

"Greater access to education will be meaningless if colleges, community colleges, and universities do not offer high quality programs to their students," the group concluded in its report released in Washington, D.C., in October. "True equity requires that all Americans have access to quality higher education -- to programs that demand college-level learning, that provide meaningful contact between faculty and students, and that serve as guides for intelligent action in the world beyond the campus."

The Study Group criticized colleges and universities for using inadequate measures of performance, such as grades and credits, as benchmarks of quality and for judging educational excellence by "input measures," such as their endowments, expenditures, the test scores of their entering students, and their selectivity in admissions, rather than by such "output" measures as the increase in their students' knowledge during college.

According to the Study Group, "adequate measures of educational excellence must be couched in terms of student outcomes -- principally such academic outcomes as knowledge, intellectual capacities, and skills," but also such personal characteristics as "self confidence, persistence, leadership,

empathy, social responsibility, and understanding of cultural and intellectual differences."

Based on their year-long study and the research of other scholars, the Study Group identified three major conditions for increasing these learning outcomes:

1 Active student involvement in the educational process -- that is, "how much time, energy, and effort students devote to the learning process";

2. High expectations of both students and institutions for themselves and each other; and

3. Intitutional use of facts about student learning in order to improve instruction.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCREASING STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

The Study Group offered seven recommendations for increasing student involvement, based on their conclusion that "the more time and effort students invest in the learning process and the more intensively they engage in their own education, the greater will be their growth and achievement, their satisfaction with their educational experiences, and their persistence in college, and the more likely they are to continue their learning."

The seven recommendations are.

1. College administrators should reallocate faculty and other institutional resources toward increased service to first- and second-year undergraduate students. ("At the present time, first-year students are ill served by many of our institutions of higher education. They are often closed out of course selections, treated impersonally, and given lower priority in academic advising than sophomores, juniors, and seniors.")

2. Faculty should make greater use of active modes of teaching and require that students take greater responsibility for their learning. (" . . the passive student is one of the greatest challenges facing higher education.")

3. Learning technologies should be designed to increase, and not reduce, the amount of personal contact between students and faculty on intellectual issues. ("Since no factor seems to account for student learning and satisfaction more than faculty contact, we are concerned about any technology that has the potential of diminishing significant intellectual contact between faculty and students, and of removing the passion from learning.")

4 All colleges should offer a systematic program of guidance and advisement that involves students from matriculation through graduation. Student affairs personnel, peer counselors, faculty, and administrators should all participate in this system on a continuing basis. ("Advisement is one of the weakest links in the education of college students.")

5 Every institution of higher education should strive to create learning communities, organized around specific intellectual themes or tasks. ("Effective learning communities such as those built around common themes (for example, ethics in science) can strengthen opportunities for intellectual dialogue and other forms of active learning.")

6. Academic and student service administrators should provide adequate fiscal support, space, and recognition to existing cocurricular programs and activities for purposes of maximizing student involvement. Every attempt should be made to include part-time and commuter students in these programs and activities ("We recommend strengthening those existing activities that have academic functions or academic overtones. Examples would include debate teams, language clubs, publications, performance groups, political clubs, and international exchange groups.")

7. Academic administrators should consolidate as many part-time teaching lines into full-time positions as possible. ("In our minds, one full-time faculty member is a better investment than three part-timers, largely because the full-time faculty member contributes to the institutional environment in ways that go beyond teaching courses ")

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REALIZING HIGH EXPECTATIONS

Eight of the group's recommendations deal with increasing student and institutional expectations -- "the educational outcomes sought by students and institutions " The Study Group indicated that "while the role of institutional expectations in influencing college student achievement is a topic that few have studied, student performance clearly rises to these expectations, and students respond positively to reasonable challenges. When educators expect too much -- when we as teachers are unrealistic -- student learning and persistence suffer When we expect too little, we will seldom be disappointed.

"At the same time," the Study Group stated, "students' expectations about themselves must match the realities of the institutions they attend. When there is a mismatch, students are not sufficiently motivated, and the necessary involvement in learning does not occur "

The eight recommendations about high expectations are:

8. Faculties and chief academic officers in each institution should agree upon and disseminate a statement of the knowledge, capacities, and skills that students must develop prior to graduation. ("To assure excellence, our colleges, community colleges, and universities should establish and maintain high standards of student and institutional performance. The results (or "outcomes") of the education offered by these institutions must be measured against their clearly and publicly articulated standards of performance.")

9. All bachelor's degree recipients should have at least two full years of liberal education. In most professional fields, this will require extending undergraduate programs beyond the usual four years. ("The

curricula prescribed for students in [many] four-year professional programs . . offer few opportunities to develop the capacities and knowledge that most institutions would expect of baccalaureate graduates Our objective in expanding these opportunities is to strengthen undergraduate professional degree programs and the future options of students who pursue them.")

10. Liberal education requirements should be expanded and reinvigorated to insure that (1) curricular content is directly addressed not only to subject matter but also to the development of capacities of analysis, problem solving, communication, and synthesis, and (2) students and faculty integrate knowledge from various disciplines. ("We are convinced that what should distinguish the baccalaureate degree from more specialized credentials is the broad learning that lies behind it. An increase in liberal education requirements is one way to guarantee that comprehensiveness.")

11. Each institution should examine and adjust the content and delivery of the curriculum to match the knowledge, capacities, and skills it expects students to develop. ("Our point of view is that it is meaningless to announce clear expectations for students and not study the existing curriculum and adjust academic programs to meet those expectations.")

12. Community colleges, colleges, and universities should supplement the credit system with proficiency assessments both in liberal education and in the student's major as a condition of awarding degrees. ("Higher education must take the lead in establishing supplements to the almost exclusive reliance on credits and grades that are too often substitutes for measures of learning. The practice we recommend will . . drive course selection and discourage the choice of the frivolous, thus guiding students to allocate and use more of their time for academic learning.")

13 Institutions should offer remedial courses and programs when necessary but should set standards and employ instructional techniques in those programs that will enable students to perform well subsequently in college-level courses. ("Students assigned to remedial programs should carry limited course loads, but they should be encouraged to include at least one course per semester in an area of academic interest to them . . . In no case should final standards of performance in remedial courses in English be normed at less than twelfth-grade levels.")

14 In rewarding faculty through retention, promotion, tenure, and compensation, all college officials directly responsible for personnel decisions should both define scholarship broadly and demand that faculty demonstrate that scholarship ("Unfortunately, the prevailing norms of the reward system in American higher education define acceptable scholarship and publication in ways that preclude some forms of productive academic inquiry and actually discourage faculty from exploring the unknown . . . . A broader definition of scholarship, we believe, will encourage faculty members and institutions to be more realistic in their expectations "

15 College presidents should strive to insure that the behavior of their institutions evidences the ideals of honesty, justice, freedom, equality,

generousity, and respect for others -- the necessary values of community. ("Students are quick to spot hypocrisies and inconsistencies in institutional behavior. They know when stated values are subverted by an institution's failure to apply the same standards of conduct to everyone. This failure leads to student cynicism -- and cynicism reduces involvement.")

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ASSESSMENT AND PROVIDING FEEDBACK

Five of the Study Group's recommendations concern assessment of student progress "as a means to provide information about the teaching and learning process and as feedback to help improve the effectiveness with which students, faculty, and the institution carry out their work." The group contends that such assessment has great potential "as a tool for clarifying expectations and for increasing student involvement when it is used to measure improvements in performance."

The five recommendations are:

16. Faculty and academic deans should design and implement a systematic program to assess the knowledge, capacities, and skills developed in students by academic and cocurricular programs. ("It is futile to adjust the content and delivery of programs in accordance with redefined, detailed objectives unless one has some ways of knowing whether those adjustments have been successful.")

17. In changing current systems of assessment, academic administrators and faculty should insure that the instruments and methods used are appropriate for (1) the knowledge, capacities, and skills addressed, and (2) the stated objectives of undergraduate education at their institutions. ("Although a wide range of instruments and methods is available, colleges too often select an instrument or technique that responds neither to the objectives nor the nature of their academic programs . . . . All instruments and methods used in assessment should reflect the level of subtlety and complexity at which college subjects are taught and learned. Faculty will justly resist resting their teaching reputations on simplistic multiple-choice examinations.")

18. Faculty should participate in the development, adoption, administration, and scoring of the instruments and procedures used in student assessment and, in the process, be trained in the ways of using assessment as a teaching tool ("The best way to connect assessment to improvement of teaching and learning is to insure that faculty have a proprietary interest in the assessment process.")

19. College officials directly responsible for faculty personnel decisions should increase the weight given to teaching in the processes of hiring and determining retention, tenure, promotion, and compensation, and should improve means of assessing teaching effectiveness. ("While research and teaching can and should be mutually supportive and complementary, many of our colleges and universities overemphasize research

and minimize quality teaching in personnel decisions, and this tradition has potentially damaging effects on student learning and development.")

20. Student evaluations of academic programs and the learning environment should be conducted regularly. The results should be widely disseminated as a basis for strengthening the quality of undergraduate baccalaureate education. ("A college needs information and feedback on the shape, sequence, coverage, emphases, texts, and other instructional material of academic programs, as well as on those aspects of the campus environment that contribute to student involvement . . . . If the only subjects on which we call for student opinion are extracurricular activities, athletics, and food service, we leave the impression that we do not value students as people capable of thinking seriously about their education.")

RECOMMENDATIONS TO GRADUATE SCHOOLS

The Study Group offers two recommendations to improve the education of potential faculty members:

21. To balance the specialization of graduate training in the disciplines, graduate departments should require applicants for admission to present evidence of a broad undergraduate liberal arts education. ("Since the ability to set an idea in a broader context is a key contribution higher education can make to students' intellectual development, we should expect faculty to model this capacity in their interaction with students. The broader contexts are derived from a liberal education.")

22. Graduate deans and department chairs should develop ways of helping prospective faculty in all disciplines (1) to learn about the history, organization, and culture of American higher education and (2) to develop their understanding of teaching and learning. ("College faculty usually receive only unsupervised on-the-job training in student advising and in the basic teaching crafts of writing syllabi, delivering lectures, designing individual learning experiences, and leading discussions. . For them to teach well, they must come to the job knowing how to determine who is learning, how much they are learning, and how they can be helped to learn more.")

RECOMMENDATIONS TO EXTERNAL AGENCIES

Four recommendations are addressed to state officials and accrediting agencies:

23. State and system-level officials should minimize the intrusion of administrative and fiscal agencies into the daily and routine operations of public colleges, community colleges, and universities ("It is a legitimate responsibility of states to audit institutional practices, to demand evidence of their effectiveness, and to correct abuses. It

is quite another matter for them to operate the institution from a distance on the assumption that faculty and administrators are either incompetent or corrupt.")

24. Accrediting agencies should hold colleges, community colleges, and universities accountable for clear statements of expectations for student learning, appropriate assessment programs to determine whether those expectations are being met, and systematic efforts to improve learning as a result of those assessments. ("If voluntary accreditation associations themselves do not insist on seeing standards realized in outcomes and assessments, external forces may eventually do so We prize the self-regulating tradition of higher education too much to allow this to happen.")

25. State officials should establish special and alternative funding for both public and private institutions to encourage efforts that promote students' involvement and institutional assessment. ("As long as states fund higher education according to . . . actuarial formulas, institutions will devote unwarranted energy to maintaining or increasing enrollments simply to meet costs. They may be able to exert little quality control, nor will they be able to assure students and their families that the credentials awarded are meaningful.")

26. State legislatures and boards of trustees should reverse the decline in faculty purchasing power by increasing faculty salaries at a rate greater than inflation. ("College faculty have lost 20 per cent of their purchasing power over the past 15 years as salary increases have failed to keep up with inflation . . . . At the present moment, the academic profession is losing some of its best people to other professions. Second, the profession has become less attractive as the deteriorating salary structure takes its toll at the point of entry.")

RECOMMENDATION TO THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

27. Federal and state agencies, private foundations, colleges, and universities, research organizations, and researchers concerned with higher education should focus their funding strategies and research activities on how to facilitate greater student learning and development. ("We need more information about what students learn in college, how they grow, and ways that learning and growth can best be assessed ")

CONCLUSION

In summary, according to the Study Group, excellence in higher education requires·

1. That institutions of higher education produce demonstrable improvements in student knowledge, capacities, skills, and attitudes between entrance and graduation;

2. That these demonstrable improvements occur within established, clearly expressed, and publicly announced and maintained standards of performance for awarding degrees based on societal and institutional definitions of college-level academic learning; and

3. That these improvements are achieved efficiently, that is, that they are cost effective in the use of student and institutional resources of time, effort, and money.

Copies of the Study Group's report, Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education, are available for $4 50 each from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, as Publication 065-000-00213-2.

CONCLUSIONS OF WILLIAM J. BENNETT, CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES, IN TO RECLAIM A LEGACY

In a 42-page report issued in late November, the chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, William J. Bennett, has urged college and university educators to restore coherence to the undergraduate curriculum by reemphasizing the humanities. According to Bennett, few of today's college graduates have received "an adequate education in the culture and civilization of which they are members," and as a result, most of them "remain shortchanged in the humanities -- history, literature, philosophy, and the ideals and practices of the past that have shaped the society they enter."

Bennett based his findings and recommendations on the work of a NEH "Study Group on the State of Learning in the Humanities in Higher Education," made up of 31 college and university faculty members and administrators.

FINDINGS

Bennett warns of eight specific conditions and trends that disturbed the members of the NEH Study Group·

1. "Many of our colleges and universities have lost a clear sense of the importance of the humanities and the purpose of education, allowing the thickness of their catalogues to substitute for vision and a philosophy of education."

2. "The humanities, and particularly the study of Western civilization, have lost their central place in the undergraduate curriculum. At best, they are but one subject among many that students might be exposed to before graduating. At worst, and too often, the humanities are virtually absent."

3. "A student can obtain a bachelor's degree from 75 percent of all American colleges and universities without having studied European history, from 72 percent without having studied American literature or history; and from 86 percent without having studied the civilization of classical Greece and Rome."

4. "Fewer than half of all colleges and universities now require foreign language study for the bachelor's degree, down from nearly 90 percent in 1966."

5. "The sole acquaintance with the humanities for many undergraduates comes during their first two years of college, often in ways that discourage further study."

6. "The number of students choosing majors in the humanities has plummeted Since 1970, the number of majors in English has declined by 57 percent, in philosophy by 41 percent, in history by 62 percent, and in modern languages by 50 percent."

7. "Too many students are graduating from American colleges and universities lacking even the most rudimentary knowledge about the history, literature, art, and philosophical foundations of their nation and their civilization "

8 "The decline in learning in the humanities was caused in part by a failure of nerve and faith on the part of many college faculties and administrators, and persists because of a vacuum in educational leadership. A recent study of college presidents found that only 2 percent are active in their institutions' academic affairs."

Bennett also notes that the NEH Study Group recommended five steps to reverse this decline:

1. "The nation's colleges and universities must reshape their undergraduate curricula based on a clear vision of what constitutes an educated person, regardless of major, and on the study of history, philosophy, language, and literature."

2. "College and university presidents must take responsibility for the educational needs of all students in their institutions by making plain what the institution stands for and what knowledge it regards as essential to a good education "

3. "Colleges and universities must reward excellent teaching in hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions."

4. "Faculties must put aside narrow departmentalism and instead work with administrators to shape a challenging curriculum with a core of common studies."

5. "Study of the humanities and Western civilization must take its place at the heart of the college curriculum."

ESSENTIAL KNOWLEDGE

Based on the discussion of the NEH Study Group, Bennett recommends the following four specific areas of knowledge in the humanities as essential to a college education:

1 "Because our society is the product and we the inheritors of Western civilization, American students need an understanding of its origins and development, from its roots in antiquity to the present. This understanding should include a grasp of the major trends in society, religion, art, literature, and politics, as well as a knowledge of basic chronology."

2. "A careful reading of several masterworks of English, American, and European literature."

3. "An understanding of the most significant ideas and debates in the history of philosophy."

4. "Demonstrable proficiency in a foreign language (either modern or classical) and the ability to view that language as an avenue into another culture."

"In addition to these areas of fundamental knowledge," Bennett states, "study group members recommended that undergraduates have some familiarity with the history, literature, religion, and philosophy of at least one non-Western culture or civilization. We think it better to have a deeper understanding of a single non-Western culture than a superficial taste of many. Finally, the study group thought that all students should study the history of science and technology "

QUESTIONS FOR EDUCATORS

Bennett concludes his report with questions for faculty members and administrators to ask themselves about their own efforts and those of their institutions regarding the humanities:

Questions for the Academic Community of Each Institution

- Does the curriculum on your campus insure that a graduate with a bachelor's degree will be conversant with the best that has been thought and written about the human condition?
- Does your curriculum reflect the best judgment of the president, deans, and faculty about what an educated person ought to know, or is it a mere smorgasbord or an expression of appeasement politics?
- Is your institution genuinely committed to teaching the humanities to undergraduates? Do your best professors teach introductory and lower division courses? Are these classes designed for the non-major and are they part of a coherent curriculum?

Questions for College and University Presidents

- Do you set an intellectual tone for the institution, articulating goals and ideals?
- Do you take a firm stand on what your institution regards as essential knowledge?
- Do you reward excellent teaching as well as good research in hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions?

Questions for Humanities Faculty

- Does your teaching make the humanities come alive by helping students confront great texts, great minds, and great ideas?
- Are you as concerned with teaching the humanities to non-majors as you are with signing up departmental majors?

Questions for Graduate Humanities Departments

- Are your graduates prepared to teach central humanities texts to undergraduates in addition to being trained as researchers and scholars?
- Are your graduates broadly educated in fields of knowledge other than their primary one? As scholars, are they concerned only with pursuing research of narrow scope or are they able as well to ask questions of wide significance?

PUBLICATION INFORMATION

Copies of Mr. Bennett's report, To Reclaim a Legacy, are available without charge from the Office of Public Affairs, Room 409, National Endowment for the Humanities, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C. 20506.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814 Telephone (916) 445-7933

A state agency created in 1974 to assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs through statewide planning and coordination.

MEMBERS

ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES